

# The Evening World.

ESTABLISHED BY JOSEPH PULITZER.  
Published Daily, Except Sundays, by the Evening World Publishing Company, Inc., 125 West 43rd Street, New York.  
RALPH PULITZER, President, 65 Park Row.  
J. ANTHONY SHAW, Treasurer, 65 Park Row.  
JOSEPH PULITZER, Jr., Secretary, 65 Park Row.

MEMBER OF THE ASSOCIATED PRESS.  
The Associated Press is authorized to use the name of this newspaper in its publications and to use the name of this newspaper in its publications and to use the name of this newspaper in its publications.

## THE GOVERNOR AS A LEADER.

**B**ECAUSE of the pressing need for housing relief before Oct. 1, The Evening World pointed out last week that:

"Tenants must place their faith in some one—in this case Gov. Smith—and give unanimous support to the programme he advocates."

The Governor's message to the Special Session justifies such an exercise of faith. He has covered the ground completely and ably.

It may be that others may have suggestions of equal merit, but no other programme which offers so much will have a chance of adoption.

From now until the essentials of this relief and construction legislation are written into law, the tenants should stand solidly with the Governor and exert all the power of their voting influence in support of the programme.

It will prove wiser not to reach for Utopia when so much concrete and immediate benefit seems attainable by concerted action.

## SWEET WRONG AGAIN.

**A**GAIN Speaker Sweet is wrong. In order to "save his face" the Speaker presumes to issue what amounts to a certificate of character to the Socialist Party.

The party, according to the Speaker, has reformed and has "Americanized" itself.

He is wrong. The Socialist Party is no less objectionable to-day than it was last January.

Its creed is as false. Its leadership is as autocratic and domineering. It is as little deserving of the support of American voters as it ever was.

Its candidates are as undesirable as representatives as they ever were. Voters will be no less mistaken in supporting Socialist candidates next November than they were last November.

The five districts made the mistake of sending five Socialists as representatives. In a democracy the voters have the right and privilege to make mistakes and to learn from those mistakes. This is the only question at issue.

Speaker Sweet was wrong in causing the ousting of the five Socialists. He is correct in recognizing their rights now. But when he turns apologist for the Socialist Party he is wrong again.

Fortunately the people have formed their own opinion of the Speaker's judgment. They registered this opinion at the polls. His effort yesterday saves neither his face nor the Socialist Party.

## FOR EMERGENCY ONLY.

**I**N ONE form or another, tax exemption is one of the most frequently recommended stimulants of building.

As a practical expedient, tax exemption promises results.

However, it should be borne in mind that tax exemption of realty, whether on mortgages or on new construction, could not be indefinitely prolonged without conflicting with generally accepted theories of taxation.

It is generally agreed that a heavier tax should be laid on "unearned incomes" than on "earned incomes." Most of the returns from mortgages and rents constitute "unearned income." One of the most valid objections to our present income tax is that it does not distinguish between the income of the professional or business man and the "coupon-clipper."

Therefore it should be clearly borne in mind that any tax exemptions should be TEMPORARY and limited to a DEFINITE TERM OF YEARS.

Relief by exemption should be regarded more as a subsidy for service in the present emergency. Such exemptions would be more desirable if they were regarded as taxes collected and then returned. In this way their character as a subsidy for immediate relief would be more manifest.

Of course, it would be foolish to go to the expense of collection and distribution, and if the TEMPORARY character of the exemptions is made clear, the desired and desirable end will be achieved without turning public opinion in the direction of the exemption of "unearned income."

## HOME RULE MOTOR LICENSES.

**C**HIEF MAGISTRATE MADDOE recommends home rule licensing of those who drive automobiles in New York City.

This is manifestly a common-sense suggestion for making city streets safer for both pedestrians and motorists. As a practical matter, every one knows that driving in crowded city streets is entirely different and infinitely more complicated than driving on country roads and in country villages.

Requirements which would be entirely reasonable

in New York City would be, and are, onerous and unreasonable in the up-State section.

Home rule licensing would provide an easy and satisfactory solution for a problem which has always vexed the Legislature. No single standard of driving ability can be required all over the State without leaving New York City practically unprotected and rural drivers unreasonably burdened.

The State would be unwilling to release the revenue derived from licensing New York drivers. This might easily be adjusted by providing that all receipts over the expense of administration should go to the State.

Arrangements for a special combined license for driving in both up-State and urban districts would be comparatively simple.

In rapid-transit regulation the Legislature has recognized the special problems of the city by creating two Public Service Commissions. Why not for motor transit?

## WHAT NO LIES CAN CONCEAL.

**T**HERE was an impressive scene in Paris yesterday the meaning of which no intelligent American can miss.

In a boundary dispute which had developed to the point of actual warfare, Poland and Lithuania agreed to suspend hostilities and accept mediation.

Lithuanian delegates shook hands with Polish delegates, and both sides expressed full confidence in the mediator.

Who or what was this mediator that put an early end to the Polish-Lithuanian war and brought the representatives of both nations into cordial agreement to arbitrate their differences?

The mediator was the Council of the LEAGUE OF NATIONS constituted and established under the Peace Treaty signed at Versailles June 28, 1919.

NOT The Hague Tribunal or any other association of nations, past or future—but the ACTUAL, PRESENT, EXISTING LEAGUE OF NATIONS FUNCTIONING AS A PARTNERSHIP OF THIRTY-SEVEN ENLIGHTENED PEOPLES to provide the civilized world with stronger safeguards against war.

The same day Finland recognized the arbitral function of the Council of the League of Nations as applying to the Aland Islands dispute, reserving only the right to decide whether there shall be held the plebiscite which Sweden urges.

All this was ONE DAY'S WORK of the WORKING LEAGUE OF NATIONS—the same League of Nations which the Republican candidate for the Presidency of the United States tried to bury on Aug. 28 last as a pitiful corpse "abandoned by Europe," "utterly impotent as a preventive of war," "unable to survive a single test."

No sooner had Senator Harding denounced the League completely off the planet than Elihu Root established, or helped to establish, an international court which could not exist without it.

And now the League insists upon going about its business of preventing or arresting wars with a success that no human being can concoct lies enough to conceal.

More thunderclaps over the porch.

Prof. Goddard, who wants to rocket his way to the moon, confesses that he will need money to construct the rocket.

Prof. Goddard is respectfully referred to the G. O. P. treasurer's headquarters staff, who will be open to engagement after Nov. 4. Their motto is to "Step On It, Boys, Get the Money."

## DEPENDING ON THE CHEMISTS.

**I**N CHEMISTRY and the Chemical Industry lies the future of American industry.

In the Chemical Exposition now being held there is much of interest. But the greater interest lies in the promise of future developments.

To an extent which the average citizen fails to realize, American business is going ahead on faith. American business men cannot see the way out, but they are depending on the chemists to guide them out of the blind lane into which they are heading.

Take the field of fuel and power. America is increasingly dependent on the internal combustion engine. Already the demand for explosive fuels is so great that the reserves of centuries are being drawn from the ground to supply current needs of a decade. Skilled geologists are able to forecast a diminution of the supply unless some new factor enters.

That is where America depends on the chemists. As the problem becomes more imperative more minds will be turned to its solution. Sooner or later a synthetic fuel will become a practical reality. American business men and American chemists do not know what it will be, but they have faith that it will be found.

As in the case of explosive fuels, so too in a hundred other lines. We are using up raw materials. Supplies are limited, but that makes no difference, for we depend on the chemist to find a substitute before the supply dwindles to nothing.

An optimistic note is evident at the Chemical Exposition. Considering the strides made in recent history of the industry, the country has a firm foundation for its faith.

## But - - -!

THE LEAGUE WILL SEND OUR BOY TO FIGHT IN EUROPE

BUT NOT WITHOUT THE CONSENT OF UNITED STATES CONGRESS



## FROM EVENING WORLD READERS

What kind of letter do you find most readable? Isn't it the one that gives you the worth of a thousand words in a couple of hundred? There is fine mental exercise and a lot of satisfaction in trying to say much in a few words. Take time to be brief.

**A Growing Protest.**  
To the Editor of The Evening World:  
The remarkable appeal published in the London Times by H. C. Wells, Sir Philip Gibbs, Sir Gilbert Murray, Gen. Sir Hubert Gough and other eminent Englishmen against the recently enacted Coercion Act gives an illustration of the errors of military repression and brutality that even Belgium was never forced to endure. I believe that the conscience of our country is deeply moved and will heartily welcome the proposed investigation of Irish affairs that the Nation is about to undertake.

The fact that the Labor Party has protested against this tyranny and murdered Moscovici's release, and that Aquith and the Liberal newspapers, and The London Times and many Unionists are doing the same, ought to prove enlightening. I have hardly ever seen so large and important a body of English public opinion arrayed against the Government. Surely these men can hardly be accused of trying to blacken their country's fame. We may discount all news from pro-Irish sources, and considering only the impressive and growing protest, representative of every English political group, find ample justification to add our protest to theirs against these iniquities.

New York, Sept. 19, 1920.

**"International" in Its Best Sense.**  
To the Editor of The Evening World:  
Please tell me, isn't the League of Nations an international organization? The Hearst newspapers call it pro-English and this puzzles me, for when I read the covenant I can find no country or nation favored more than the others.

Some newspapers say that the League of Nations was made by English statesmen. I thought the whole world was represented. Am I right or wrong? Besides, will you please tell me what difference it makes who made the covenant as long as it is a good thing that can help to improve the world?

H. D. HANS.  
2119 Hughes Avenue, Sept. 17, 1920.

**Published Saturday in The Evening World.**  
To the Editor of The Evening World:  
Will you kindly advise me as to where I can obtain a digest of the articles of the League of Nations and covenant, or at least a copy of them?

As a partly disabled veteran of a late popular war, I am for the League, and I want to be thoroughly posted on its points, particularly Article X, and the one pertaining to dreaded England's plurality of votes, as I come in daily contact with unbelieveable ignorance and prejudice toward the covenant displayed by eligible voters.

I must compliment you on your defense of the League, though I do wish that you would undertake a broader campaign of education so that the "yellow streak" element of "freedom" voters will "snap into" their responsibility to their children, their Nation and humanity at large.

128 32d Street, Woodliff-on-Hudson, N. J.

**He Might Easily Have Said So.**  
To the Editor of The Evening World:  
Your editorial in yesterday's issue found fault with Mr. Harding for expressing the thought that "assimilation" should be the test for admission of immigrants. I should like to bring to your attention the fact that Mr. Harding must have had more than the Japanese in mind when he spoke. It would seem to me that he meant clearly to cover the question of admitting to this country persons who carry with them the idea that they are still a race or a nation within this nation.

Think this over, and maybe you will comprehend what every loyal American understands Mr. Harding to mean.

C. MOWBRAY WHITE, D. D.  
Brooklyn, N. Y., Sept. 17, 1920.

**"The News From Maine."**  
To the Editor of The Evening World:  
You were fair enough to print my letter of the 7th inst., disingenuous, as it did, from the conclusions arrived at by you in your otherwise specious and clever editorial entitled "Fury Americans." To-night's issue, however, has a letter from an individual who signs himself F. H. Allen.

His statements are incoherent and rambling. Inferentially he puts me in the class of what he terms "hypophantes."

The fact that I am of "Anglo-Saxon" descent should not weaken or emasculate the force of my statements. I declared in that letter, and I now repeat it, that after voting for eight fifty years for Democratic candidates my conscience constrains me this year to vote for Senator Harding. Not only myself, but all the members of my household.

The present situation is most intent on plunging this country into the vortex of interminable European and Asiatic wars than trying to bring about normal conditions in our own country. This country has grown great, populous and rich because it has sedulously avoided entangling alliances.

Has F. H. Allen heard the news from Maine? The upheaval in that state unmistakably forebodes what will happen in November all over the country.

GEORGE V. BRYANT.  
New York, Sept. 17, 1920.

**Passed With a Joker.**  
To the Editor of The Evening World:  
Did not the Board of Aldermen last year pass a law preventing profiteering by moving van owners?

Last September I was charged \$10 for one load of furniture moved to a storage warehouse. The charge today is \$45 for the same load going the same distance back. This is a slight advance of 350 per cent. If there is no ordinance preventing this practice

## UNCOMMON SENSE

By John Blake.

(Copyright, 1920, by John Blake.)

THE MAN WHO QUILTS.

Starting is easy enough. Any man can start to remove a mountain. The French started to build the Panama Canal. They had money and engineering ability. But it was the Americans who built the canal.

Most people make many starts in life. Anybody ought to be allowed at least three starts. It usually requires that many to discover what you are fitted for.

But once you have made the last start you must stick or lose. Thousands of young men now in the college will spend their lives making starts, and getting no further. Even with their better training and their opportunity for finding out what they can do, they will not succeed.

But a very fair percentage of them once they start, will keep at it, whether your profession is the law or medicine or engineering or literature. And because they will keep going after they start they will win.

Mark Twain, who at his death was the foremost man in American letters, made several starts—the first as a pilot—a calling at which he would have succeeded. But he knew that piloting was not a career.

His other starts were failures. He was physically lazy, and his associates believed that because he would do no hard work, he would prove worthless.

But when he undertook to write he stuck to it, and it soon developed that his laziness was only physical. He had tremendous mental energy, and it carried him to great success.

He was not very successful at first, but he stuck to literature with the result that every man who reads knows well.

The park benches and the poorhouses are peopled with quitters. All of them have started at something or other, most of them with high hopes of success.

But when they found that life was difficult, they lost their nerve and quit.

Don't put too much value on the start, or build too much confidence on it. Remember anybody can start anything. Keeping at it steadily, through hard times and good, through discouragement as well as encouragement, will enable you to finish where you are entitled to finish.

Nothing is easy that is worth while. But keep at anything, provided it is capable of accomplishment, and you will make headway, and win success. But keep at it. Don't be content with a start, even if it is a good one.

would it not be advisable to inform the Department of Justice about these bandits?

Kindly inform me through the columns of The Evening World, which paper I have read for twenty years.

STORAGE.

**Hardships of the Job.**  
To the Editor of The Evening World:  
If "E. P. A." thinks it requires no brain or brawn to pull a bell cord and ring up the fares, the job is open to him if he wants to make a change. How would he like to swing around some of the human avalanches who insist on standing on the running board of a crowded open trolley and dodging elevated pillars and

motor trucks, especially during rush hours?

I would also like to ask him if he wishes either to stay in his bed until his office job pulls him out of his slumber at probably 7.30 or later, or would he like to rise at 4 A. M. and go out in some of the blinding snow storms and freezing mornings we had last winter and work until 6 or 7 o'clock in the evening and not get home until 8. Let him do that for seven days a week year in and year out, then he will probably say it requires not only brain and brawn but 300 per cent. man-power and grit.

JOHN T. HOGAN,  
Jefferson Avenue, Brooklyn  
Sept. 15, 1920.



## Primer of the League of Nations

By Richard Linthum

This Primer of the League of Nations, in the form of a conversation, is not intended to be an argument, but an explanation.

The first instalment beneath treats of the purpose of the League, the nature and character of its authority, how derived and the limits thereof; the difference between a League and a Federation or a superstate, with some historical facts concerning the drafting and adoption of the Covenant.

Question—What is the League of Nations?

Answer—An organization composed of self-governing nations, dominions and colonies that have made and ratified a covenant (mutual promise, agreement) in the interest of world peace and just dealings between nations.

Q.—What are its specific purposes?

A.—They are set forth in a preamble to the Covenant. Reduced to simplest terms they are:

To promote co-operation between nations and to bring about world peace and security

(1) by agreeing not to resort to war;

(2) by making rules for open, fair and honorable relations between nations;

(3) by establishing international law as the actual rule of conduct among governments, and

(4) by maintaining justice in all dealings and a thorough respect for all treaty obligations.

Q.—What is the importance of the preamble as related to the Covenant itself?

A.—The preamble is the key to the Covenant; it states the objects to be accomplished; all grants of power in the Covenant must be interpreted in accordance with the preamble, just as the grants of power in the Constitution of the United States are interpreted in accordance with the Preamble to that great document.

Q.—What is the Covenant?

A.—It is the Constitution of the League; it contains the grants of authority to act and provides and defines the methods of carrying out the purposes of the preamble.

Q.—Does the League constitute a Federation of Nations or a superstate—a government superior to and with power over all governments?

A.—No. The League is limited to the purposes defined in the preamble. It is not a federation, but an association of nations, its powers and functions all based upon mutual promises and agreements, exercised and carried out by unanimous consent, thus lacking any arbitrary power to constrain or limit governments as would be necessary to constitute a superstate.

Q.—Does the ratification of the Covenant by a nation involve the surrender of that nation's sovereignty?

A.—No. The sovereignty of the nation is only affected to the extent that it is affected by any treaty of arbitration, of which the United States has many, not to any greater extent than an individual would surrender his liberty and honor by agreeing to perform his part of a proper mutual contract. The Covenant of the League contains no grant of authority whatever over the domestic internal affairs of any nation.

Q.—Under what circumstances was the League formed and the Covenant adopted?

A.—The League was formed at the Peace Conference which made the Treaty of Peace with Germany, known as the Versailles Treaty. The Covenant of the League was formally adopted at a plenary session April 28, 1919, three months and sixteen days later, although the Peace Treaty including the Covenant was not signed until June 28, 1919.

The Treaty was submitted to the Senate of the United States on July 18, 1919, which finally refused to ratify it on March 3, 1920.

The Senate took nearly five months longer to debate the Covenant and reject it than the delegates to the Peace Conference took to frame and adopt it.

Q.—Is the League actually in existence?

A.—Yes. It is a "going concern," organizing its Commissions and other bodies, and has already taken action in cases that threatened the peace of the world.

Q.—What is its membership?

A.—Thirty-nine nations are now members, including those originally named at the Paris Peace Conference and all the neutral nations invited to join.

Q.—Are all of the Allied and Associated Powers in the late war against the Teutonic Central Powers?

A.—All except two: Russia, the government of which has not been recognized by any nation, and the United States of America.

(The next instalment of the Primer of the League will take up the Covenant, article by article.)